REMARKS

In their response dated December 11, 2006, to a restriction requirement set forth in the Office Action mailed September 29, 2006, Applicants had restricted the above-referenced invention to Group II (claims 43-48):

Group I: Claims 1-42, drawn to a (1) a method for treating a neurodegenerative disease in a subject, (2) a method for treating epilepsy in a subject by delivering a vector encoding a glutamic acid decarboxylase (GAD), (3) a method for treating epilepsy in a subject by delivering an adeno-associated viral (AAV) vector encoding GAD, and (4) a method of altering expression of GAD in a region of the central nervous system (CNS) of a subject with epilepsy, classified in class 424, subclass 93.2 and class 514, 44;

Group II: Claims 43-48, drawn to a vector comprising a nucleotide sequence encoding GAD classified in class 435, subclass 320.1.

Claims 1-42 belonging to Group I were withdrawn by the Applicant from further prosecution.

Upon the election of an invention belonging to either Group I or II, the Examiner had also required Applicants to elect a species from the following list covering different types of gene transfer vectors:

A. Adenovirus vector;

B. Herpes virus vector;

C. Parvovirus vector;

D. Lentivirus vector;

E. Adeno-associated viral vector;

F. Liposome-mediated deliver vector.

In their response dated December 11, 2006, Applicants had submitted that claim 41 was generic and patentable regardless of the type of gene transfer vector used.

However, for the purposes of speeding prosecution, Applicants had elected:

Species E drawn to an Adeno-Associated Viral Vector

Applicants invite the Examiner to call the undersigned attorney if there are any further questions and to speed prosecution.

Dated: March 20, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

By_____

George A. Xixis
Registration No.: 38,664
NUTTER MCCLENNEN & FISH LLP
World Trade Center West
155 Seaport Boulevard
Boston, Massachusetts 02210-2604
(617)439-2746
(617) 310-9746 (FAX)
Attorney for Applicants

1612461.1